PHILOSOPHY AND ETHICS

IMPORTANT INFORMATION

Syllabus review

Once a course syllabus has been accredited by the School Curriculum and Standards Authority, the implementation of that syllabus will be monitored by the Course Advisory Committee. This committee can advise the Board of the Authority about any need for syllabus review. Syllabus change deemed to be minor requires schools to be notified of the change at least six months before implementation. Major syllabus change requires schools to be notified 18 months before implementation. Formal processes of syllabus review and requisite reaccreditation will apply.

Other sources of information

The Western Australian Certificate of Education (WACE) Manual contains essential information on assessment, moderation and examinations that need to be read in conjunction with this course.

The School Curriculum and Standards Authority website www.scsa.wa.edu.au and extranet provides support materials including sample programs, course outlines, assessment outlines, assessment tasks with marking keys, past WACE examinations with marking keys, grade descriptions with annotated student work samples and standards guides.

WACE providers

Throughout this document the term 'school' is intended to include both schools and other WACE providers.

Currency

This document may be subject to minor updates. Users who download and print copies of this document are responsible for checking for updates. Advice about any changes made to the document is provided through the Authority communication processes.

2008/16115[v15]

Rationale

Philosophical thought shapes what people think, what they value, what they consider to be true, and how they engage with others and the world around them. It is one of the foundations of all academic disciplines. It seeks to shed light on questions such as: what is real? what and how do we understand? how should we live? what is it to be human; and who am I? It deals with issues and problems that cannot be addressed adequately by appealing to experience and experiment alone. Philosophical inquiry require that we question our assumptions, beliefs and our reasons for holding them.

Doing philosophy is a practical activity. We do philosophy, for example, when we seek to define something, when we challenge assumptions, when we construct an argument, and when we think about what we are doing, how we are doing it and to what ends. The study of philosophy gives us a set of skills that better enables us to understand, evaluate and engage with our world, whether that is our personal or our social world, our world of work or the wider questions of how the world works.

The relation between the disciplines of Philosophy and Ethics in this course requires some explanation. Traditionally ethics has been regarded as a branch of philosophy (alongside metaphysics and epistemology), so that reference to philosophy will normally include reference to ethics. The title 'Philosophy and Ethics' gives ethics a prominent status, signifying that it has particular importance in this course. This status recognises that every member of a society faces ethical issues. A philosophical approach helps people to reflect on, and better understand, difficult ethical issues.

In Philosophy and Ethics, disagreement is common. Methods of inquiry and the skills of critical reasoning help us deal more effectively with disagreement. This course places considerable emphasis on students who contribute constructively to a philosophical Community of Inquiry.

A philosophical Community of Inquiry at its simplest is a collaborative and cooperative pedagogical strategy through which students learn with others, and from others, how to engage in philosophical discourse. Such discourse seeks to clarify, analyse, evaluate and define concepts and issues so as to help students understand and deal with complex questions raised by popular culture, by contemporary events and by the history of ideas. A community of philosophical inquiry uses the skills of critical reasoning to help students deal more effectively and tolerantly with disagreement.

In this course, students learn that the above skills can be transferred to many different situations and contexts. They are empowered to better deal with problems in their personal, social and working lives. Students undertaking Philosophy and Ethics will acquire these skills and become thinkers who recognise and reflect critically on philosophical issues in the light of their own and others' experiences. Philosophy and Ethics aims to empower students to make independent judgements on the basis of reason. Through this process they better understand a world of increasing complexity in which not just new, but old categories of problems will arise.

Philosophy and Ethics makes a unique contribution to understanding the self. It examines the dynamic relationship between what it means to be a person, and also what it means to be a citizen who recognises the rights of others and makes choices in the social, civic and environmental spheres. Understanding the self cannot happen in isolation, so we need to look at ourselves through our interactions with others. Students need to critically evaluate a range of ideas and theories so they may answer the question: how should we live?

Employers are increasingly searching for people who can analyse new situations and devise and evaluate appropriate strategies to manage them. Philosophy and Ethics develops thinking skills and moral discernment that students apply to a range of practical situations in their personal, social and working lives. Such skills might be as evident in the mechanic who discusses with the owner why a machine is not working and what should be done as it would be in a doctor diagnosing illness and discussing treatment options with a patient. The course is relevant to students focusing on the study of Philosophy at university. It is of equal value to those following career paths that require the evaluation of arguments, such as law, or those needing to make complex judgements, such as in medical, pastoral or other human service occupations. Philosophy and Ethics is also relevant to those entering careers involving aesthetics such as advertising and design.

Course outcomes

Philosophy and Ethics is designed to facilitate the achievement of four outcomes.

Outcome 1: Philosophical and ethical inquiry
Students use investigative methods to think and argue philosophically.
In achieving this outcome, students:
- participate in open philosophical communities of inquiry;
- explore philosophical and ethical concepts, ideas and ideals; and
- use critical reasoning methods to recognise, analyse, evaluate and develop arguments.

Outcome 2: Philosophical and ethical perspectives

Students understand that there are philosophical and ethical approaches to making meaning.

In achieving this outcome, students:

- understand that there are different ways of knowing;
- understand that there are different viewpoints on the nature of reality; and
- understand that people need to give good reasons for how they live.

Outcome 3: Philosophy and ethics in human affairs

Students understand that philosophical and ethical thinking has a role in human affairs.

In achieving this outcome, students:

- understand that there are philosophical traditions;
- understand that there are different world views; and
- understand the influence of philosophical ideas on contemporary culture.

Outcome 4: Applying and relating philosophical and ethical understandings

Students reflect on, evaluate and respond to a range of human issues by selecting from a repertoire of philosophical and ethical strategies.

In achieving this outcome, students:

- evaluate different ways of knowing about a range of practical issues;
- reflect on understandings of the nature of reality and human nature and their relationship to practical issues and situations; and
- use philosophical and ethical reasoning to respond critically to aspects of human activity.

Course content

The course content is the focus of the learning program.

The Community of Inquiry is an essential process for achievement in the course. The 'how do we know?' content area focuses on students acquiring the necessary knowledge and skills for the Community of Inquiry.

The course content is divided into three content areas and each connects to one of three branches of philosophy:

- how do we know?   (epistemology)
- what is real?   (metaphysics)
- how should we live?   (ethics)

How do we know?

Critical reasoning

An argument is a series of premises or claims leading to a conclusion. Critical reasoning (critical thinking) uses a suite of tools to recognise, analyse, evaluate and develop arguments. These tools enable students to identify assumptions, recognise fallacies, discern relevance and irrelevance, differentiate between validity and truth, and distinguish between strong and weak inferences. Students examine real life examples and use natural, rather than formal symbolic language to practise critical reasoning.

Methods of inquiry

Different disciplines use different methods of inquiry. Philosophy engages with, and reflects on, these methods and involves becoming familiar with a variety of tools such as: observation, common sense, the use of examples and counter-examples, sceptical doubt, conceptual analysis, analogical thinking, and the formulation and testing of hypotheses.

Imagination and interpretation

Philosophy begins in wonder. It engages in imagination and interpretation by exploring multiple possibilities. It delights in differences by keeping questions open and reflecting on complex experiences. For example, beauty is one such experience. The study of beauty is aesthetics, which is a branch of philosophy that discusses concrete examples from art, literature and everyday experience in conjunction with the historical and contemporary theories of aesthetics. Beauty is an example of a concept that can be best understood through imagination and interpretation.

Analysing, clarifying and evaluating concepts

Since Socrates, philosophy has focused critical attention on the central concepts of our understanding and thinking, and of ethical life. The study of Philosophy and Ethics requires the skills of interpretation, scrutiny, debate and the definition of central concepts. This is often best achieved through forms of philosophical dialogue, such as Community of Inquiry and Socratic questioning.

What is real?

Scientific world view

Science comprises a tradition which generates both theories aimed at describing, exploring, explaining and predicting the world, and also techniques for testing, assessing, and applying those theories. The scientific tradition sees the world as governed by forces, patterns and causal relations that are rationally intelligible, and capable of being investigated by scientific methods. These methods employ reason, observation, experimentation and interpretation. The study of philosophy aims to clarify and analyse the assumptions of science, and to clarify and assess its methods and techniques.

Conceptions of ultimate reality

Philosophy explores the notion of ultimate reality by examining such ideas as materialism, naturalism, theism and pantheism, and related concepts. It addresses the question of the limits of knowledge. Philosophy asks how we can approach an understanding of ultimate reality, and whether it is beyond our understanding. It considers questions such as whether God or gods exist and what form they may take. It examines the distinction between the empirically knowable and that which may be known to exist prior to experience.

Persons

An understanding of what a person is underpins our thinking on a range of social and philosophical issues. The concept of personhood includes such elements as perception, intention, embodiment, beliefs, consciousness, memory, free will, self-awareness, reason, social relations and moral sense. These notions and how they relate to each other provide a better understanding of broader issues involving persons.

How should we live?

Governance

How should we be governed? What are the best forms of governance for nations and states, local communities, organisations of various sorts, families or friendship groups? What criteria should we use to determine what is good and what is best for a given social group at a given time? The idea of governance includes such concepts as justice, liberty, democracy, rights, collective decision-making, and the use and abuse of power.

Communities and cultures

Philosophy explores the relationship between community and culture, and examines our values, beliefs and shared agreements on how we should live within communities and cultures. It examines such concepts as respect, responsibility, tolerance, prejudice, cultural difference, and cultural relativism. Philosophy inquires into our basic beliefs and values, and how they relate to their cultural and community contexts.

Self and others

The primary relationship in ethics is between one individual and another: the I-thou relationship. However, this relationship raises many questions such as: how should I behave towards others?; how should I relate to my community?; is there a best way to treat oneself?; what is a good life?; to what extent can I take responsibility for my actions?; and how should I relate to the natural world? These questions involve concepts such as harm, benefit, rights, duties, virtues, vices, integrity, happiness, individual self-interest, the common good, and social and environmental responsibility.

Course units

Each unit is defined with a particular focus and suggested learning contexts through which the specific unit content can be taught and learnt. The cognitive difficulty of the content increases with each stage. The pitch of the content for each stage is notional and there will be overlap between stages.

Stage 1 units provide bridging support and a practical and applied focus to help students develop skills required to be successful for Stage 2 units.

Stage 2 units provide opportunities for applied learning but there is a focus more on academic learning.

Stage 3 units provide opportunities to extend knowledge and understandings in challenging academic learning contexts.

Unit 1APAE

The focus for this unit is **reason and actions**. Students examine some basic elements of reasoning; the distinction between opinion and evidence; the idea of personhood; work, leisure and society; and society, rights and obligations.

Unit 1BPAE

The focus for this unit is **reason and happiness**. Students examine the basic components of argument: the concept of fairness; concepts of human fulfilment; material and psychological wellbeing; and the ethics and values of friendship.

Unit 2APAE

The focus for this unit is **reason and persons**. Students examine reasoning, inference, doubt and proof: the construction of world views; ideas of mind, body and personhood; ideas of action, intention, motives, free-will and determinism; and the elements of a personal ethic.

Unit 2BPAE

The focus for this unit is **reason and culture**. Students examine ideas of beauty and aesthetics: the interpretation of art and literature; the idea of culture; intuition and emotion; and personal relationships and friendship.

Unit 3APAE

The focus for this unit is **reason and society.** Students examine the mapping of arguments: humanism, religion and values; individualism and social identity; the ideals of a good society; and the ideals of politics and government.

Unit 3BPAE

The focus for this unit is **reason and meaning.** Students examine complex arguments: a number of higher-order systems of inquiry; ways of understanding the relation between religion and science; and ethical issues of life and death.

Time and completion requirements

The notional hours for each unit are 55 class contact hours. Units can be delivered typically in a semester or in a designated time period up to a year depending on the needs of the students. Pairs of units can also be delivered concurrently over a one year period. Schools are encouraged to be flexible in their timetabling in order to meet the needs of all of their students.

Refer to the WACE Manual for more information about unit and course completion.

Resources

Teacher support materials are available on the School Curriculum and Standards Authority website extranet and can be found at www.scsa.wa.edu.au

Vocational Education and Training information

Vocational Education and Training (VET) is nationally recognised training that provides people with occupational knowledge and skills and credit towards, or attainment of, a vocational education and training qualification under the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF).

When considering VET delivery in WACE courses it is necessary to:
- refer to the WACE Manual, Section 5: Vocational Education and Training, and
- contact education sector/systems representatives for information on operational issues concerning VET delivery options in schools.

Australian Quality Training Framework (AQTF)
AQTF is the quality system that underpins the national vocational education and training sector and outlines the regulatory arrangements in states and territories. It provides the basis for a nationally consistent, high-quality VET system.

The AQTF Essential Conditions and Standards for Registered Training Organisations outline a set of auditable standards that must be met and maintained for registration as a training provider in Australia.

VET integrated delivery
VET integrated within a WACE course involves students undertaking one or more VET units of competency concurrently with a WACE course unit.

No unit equivalence is given for units of competency attained in this way.

VET integrated can be delivered by schools providing they meet AQTF requirements. Schools need to become a Registered Training Organisation (RTO) or work in a partnership arrangement with an RTO to deliver training within the scope for which they are registered. If a school operates in partnership with an RTO, it will be the responsibility of the RTO to assure the quality of the training delivery and assessment.

Glossary of Terms

Consilience: the concept that knowledge exists in an orderly and unified interdisciplinary state, and that all interpretations and conclusions in any inquiry should be a part of that orderliness and unity.

Dialectic:
1. a Socratic conversation or dialogue in which contradictory claims about basic beliefs or first principles are analysed and evaluated, with the stronger claim judged as the best way to proceed in an inquiry [from Plato]
2. a process of resolving logically opposite yet equally compelling claims about an idea or concept so that such claims exist no longer in dichotomy but as synthesised knowledge [from Hegel].

Dialogue: the use of conversation as philosophical inquiry by extending obligations and rights to the participants e.g. the Community of Inquiry.

Elenchus: the Socratic method of question and answer that seeks to clarify a complex idea by eradicating contradictions, often through examples from daily life, especially from crafts and skills.

Hermeneutics: the philosophical study of interpretation and meaning that involves considering others perspectives beside our own, as well as the relationship between the part and the whole in text and context.

Marginalisation: the state of being outside or on the edge of mainstream society and culture in unjust conditions as a direct result of mainstream social and cultural attitudes or prejudices e.g. living on the margin.

Phenomenology: the philosophical study of conscious experiences in order to reveal the forces, whether natural or spiritual, human or non-human, that drive the phenomena and so make up the essential elements of the experience, both in its subjective and objective sense.

Scientific method: the agreed method of gathering and interpreting phenomena in the sciences through observation, description, prediction, replication and explanation (identify, correlate, and sequence cause and effect).

Assessment

The WACE Manual contains essential information on principles, policies and procedures for school-based assessment and WACE examinations that needs to be read in conjunction with this document.

School-based assessment

The table below provides details of the assessment types for this course and the weighting range for each assessment type.

Teachers are required to use the assessment table to develop their own assessment outline for each unit (or pair of units) of the course.

This outline includes a range of assessment tasks and indicates the weighting for each task and each assessment type. It also indicates the content and course outcomes each task covers.

If a pair of units is assessed using a combined assessment outline, the assessment requirements must still be met for each unit.

In developing an assessment outline and teaching program the following guidelines should be taken into account.

- All assessment tasks should take into account the teaching, learning and assessment principles outlined in the WACE Manual.
- There is flexibility for teachers to design school-based assessment tasks to meet the learning needs of students.
- The assessment table outlines the forms of student response required for this course.
- Student work submitted to demonstrate achievement should only be accepted if the teacher can attest that, to the best of her/his knowledge, all uncited work is the student's own.
- Evidence collected for each unit must include assessment tasks conducted under test conditions together with other forms of assessment tasks.

Assessment table		
Weightings for types		**Type of assessment**
Stage 1	**Stages 2 and 3**	
20–40%	20–40%	**Analysis, clarification and evaluation** This assessment type allows for the philosophical analysis and evaluation of texts (e.g. community of inquiry transcripts, passages and/or images) and involves summarising, explaining and critiquing arguments through a range of written and oral responses. It is particularly suitable to the assessment of critical reasoning skills. *Best suited to the collection of evidence on student achievement of course Outcome 4 in combination with one or more of the other course outcomes.*
20–40%	20–40%	**Construction of argument** This assessment type allows for the demonstration of skills and concepts in critical reasoning and methods of inquiry. It is particularly suited to an extended written response such as an essay, feature article, letter, journal entry and/or editorial. *Best suited to the collection of evidence on student achievement of course Outcomes 2, 3 and 4.*
10–30%	10–30%	**Philosophical inquiry** This assessment type assesses student participation in the community of inquiry, which is essential to the practice of philosophy in the course. It also includes the possibility of an open-ended research or a small research task. Tasks involve an investigation of key concepts, thinkers and/or thinking, and allow for the application of possible solutions to identified problems. This assessment type encourages the exploration of concepts and their development, the reflection on learning processes, and the critical evaluation and modification of concepts. Students may choose written, oral or multimedia presentation. Students may use online discussion boards, groups, blogs or group emails. Students may produce philosophical dialogues using critical and creative thinking. *Best suited to the collection of evidence on student achievement of course Outcome 1 in combination with one or more of the other course outcomes.*
0–20%	10–30%	**Examination** This assessment type allows for the demonstration of understanding on items of critical reasoning, philosophical analysis and evaluation of texts, and the construction of argument. *Suited to the collection of evidence of student achievement of all course outcomes.*

Grades

Schools report student achievement in a completed unit at Stage 1, 2 or 3 in terms of grades. The following grades are used:

Grade	Interpretation
A	Excellent achievement
B	High achievement
C	Satisfactory achievement
D	Limited achievement
E	Inadequate achievement

Each grade is based on the student's overall performance for the unit as judged by reference to a set of pre-determined standards. These standards are defined by grade descriptions and annotated work samples.

The grade descriptions for this course are provided in Appendix 1. They can also be accessed, together with annotated work samples, through the Guide to Grades link on the course page of the Authority website at www.scsa.wa.edu.au

Refer to the WACE Manual for further information regarding grades.

WACE Examinations

In their final year, students who are studying at least one Stage 2 pair of units (e.g. 2A/2B) or one Stage 3 pair of units (e.g. 3A/3B) are required to sit an examination in this course, unless they are exempt.

WACE examinations are not held for Stage 1 units and/or Preliminary Stage units. Any student may enrol to sit a Stage 2 or Stage 3 examination as a private candidate.

Each examination assesses the specific content described in the syllabus for the pair of units studied.

Details of the WACE examinations in this course are prescribed in the WACE examination design briefs (pages 23–25).

Refer to the WACE Manual for further information regarding WACE examinations.

Standards Guides

Standards for this course are exemplified in Standards Guides. They include examination questions, annotated candidate responses at the 'excellent' and 'satisfactory' achievement bands, statistics for each question and comments from examiners. The guides are published on the Authority's web site at www.scsa.wa.edu.au and are accessed under Examination materials. An extranet log-in is required to view the guides.

UNIT 1APAE

Unit description
The unit description provides the focus for teaching the specific unit content.

The focus for this unit is **reason and actions**. Students examine some basic elements of reasoning; the distinction between opinion and evidence; the idea of personhood; work, leisure and society; and society, rights and obligations.

Suggested learning contexts
Within the broad area of **reason and actions**, teachers may choose one or more of the suggested learning contexts (this is not an exhaustive list):
- the individual in the world of work e.g. covering rights, safety, legal and moral duties
- conscience and action e.g. Why should I do voluntary community work? Why should I uphold standards in the workplace?
- contemporary innovation, invention and discovery
- school life.

Unit content
This unit includes knowledge, understandings and skills to the degree of complexity described below:

How do we know?

Critical reasoning
- recognition of facts and giving reasons for opinions
- the use of experience and other kinds of evidence to understand problems.

Methods of inquiry
- recognising and being able to ask both closed (fact-based) and open (debatable) questions
- formulating simple hypotheses and using practical observations to obtain evidence for or against these hypotheses
- understanding the idea of goodness in inquiry
- types of inquiry: dialogue.

Imagination and interpretation
- the distinction between invention and discovery
- devising possible ways of solving problems using imagination and interpretation
- 'lateral' thinking as an act of imagination.

Analysing, clarifying and evaluating concepts
- the concepts of work, leisure and play
- understanding what an obligation is and recognising that some obligations are mutual
- the concepts of safety, duty, harm and benefit.

What is real?

Scientific world view
- distinction between subjective judgement and objective information, and how science uses these concepts.

Conceptions of ultimate reality
- different ways of thinking about ultimate reality.

Persons
- general characteristics that help to define being a person such as consciousness, reason, language, social membership, emotions, intentional actions, creativity, embodiment, accountability, responsibility, and authenticity.

How should we live?

Governance
- the nature of laws
- distinction between laws and rules
- legal and moral rights
- the basis for rights
- fairness and rights.

Communities and cultures
- various kinds of paid and unpaid work
- relationship between work and community life
- voluntary community work
- the value of work to individuals, families and more broadly, what counts as good work.

Self and others
- rights of individuals
- moral and legal duties to others
- identification of some of the moral virtues.

Assessment

The four types of assessment in the table below are consistent with the teaching and learning strategies considered to be the most supportive of student achievement of the outcomes in the Philosophy and Ethics course. The table provides details of the assessment type, examples of different ways that these assessment types can be applied and the weighting range for each assessment type.

Weighting Stage 1	Type of assessment
20–40%	**Analysis, clarification and evaluation** This assessment type allows for the philosophical analysis and evaluation of texts (e.g. community of inquiry transcripts, passages and/or images) and involves summarising, explaining and critiquing arguments through a range of written and oral responses. It is particularly suitable to the assessment of critical reasoning skills. *Best suited to the collection of evidence on student achievement of course Outcome 4 in combination with one or more of the other course outcomes.*
20–40%	**Construction of argument** This assessment type allows for the demonstration of skills and concepts in critical reasoning and methods of inquiry. It is particularly suited to an extended written response such as an essay, feature article, letter, journal entry and/or editorial. *Best suited to the collection of evidence on student achievement of course Outcomes 2, 3 and 4.*
10–30%	**Philosophical inquiry** This assessment type assesses student participation in the community of inquiry, which is essential to the practice of philosophy in the course. It also includes the possibility of an open-ended research or a small research task. Tasks involve an investigation of key concepts, thinkers and/or thinking, and allow for the application of possible solutions to identified problems. This assessment type encourages the exploration of concepts and their development, the reflection on learning processes, and the critical evaluation and modification of concepts. Students may choose written, oral or multimedia presentation. Students may use online discussion boards, groups, blogs or group emails. Students may produce philosophical dialogues using critical and creative thinking. *Best suited to the collection of evidence on student achievement of course Outcome 1 in combination with one or more of the other course outcomes.*
0–20%	**Examination** This assessment type allows for the demonstration of understanding on items of critical reasoning, philosophical analysis and evaluation of texts, and the construction of argument. *Suited to the collection of evidence of student achievement of all course outcomes.*

UNIT 1BPAE

Unit description
The unit description provides the focus for teaching the specific unit content.

The focus for this unit is **reason and happiness**. Students examine the basic components of argument: the concept of fairness; concepts of human fulfilment; material and psychological wellbeing; and the ethics and values of friendship.

Suggested learning contexts
Within the broad area of **reason and happiness**, teachers may choose one or more of the suggested learning contexts (this is not an exhaustive list):
- shopping, fashion, celebrity and material possessions
- sports, games and leisure
- family, friendship and me.

Unit content
This unit includes knowledge, understandings and skills to the degree of complexity described below:

How do we know?

Critical reasoning
- understanding what it means to make an inference
- recognising the role of assumptions and intuitions in reasoning.

Methods of inquiry
- the use of examples and counter-examples in arguing for or against a proposition
- diagnosing, from practical observation, a range of problems and generating and testing hypotheses to resolve these
- types of inquiry: elenchus.

Imagination and interpretation
- use of imagination to develop different types of questions
- use of imaginative analogies in developing arguments.

Analysing, clarifying and evaluating concepts
- concepts of pleasure, happiness and wellbeing as examples of conceptual clarification
- the concept of a game
- the concept of fairness in games, and the role of umpires and other arbitrators in games
- the concept of fairness in a broader social context.

What is real?

Scientific world view
- connections between science and technology
- criteria for evaluating new technologies
- the idea of material/scientific progress and its relationship to human happiness.

Conceptions of ultimate reality
- different ideas of what is a good life and how to achieve it.

Persons
- the ideas of pleasure, happiness, fulfilment and wellbeing
- material wellbeing and psychological wellbeing
- roles of family and friendship in wellbeing
- the idea of personal autonomy
- the idea of authenticity.

How should we live?

Governance
- the concept of rights
- various sources of rights
- the concept of leadership
- various forms of leadership
- social roles of umpires, judges, law-makers and citizens.

Communities and cultures
- the diversity of cultural mores
- understanding cultural differences
- cultural differences and human happiness.

Self and others
- the concept of friendship
- the value and importance of friendship
- ethics of friendship e.g. responsibility, accountability, fulfilment, right, wrong
- peer pressure and friendship
- moral virtues and friendship.

Assessment

The four types of assessment in the table below are consistent with the teaching and learning strategies considered to be the most supportive of student achievement of the outcomes in the Philosophy and Ethics course. The table provides details of the assessment type, examples of different ways that these assessment types can be applied and the weighting range for each assessment type.

Weighting Stage 1	Type of assessment
20–40%	**Analysis, clarification and evaluation** This assessment type allows for the philosophical analysis and evaluation of texts (e.g. community of inquiry transcripts, passages and/or images) and involves summarising, explaining and critiquing arguments through a range of written and oral responses. It is particularly suitable to the assessment of critical reasoning skills. *Best suited to the collection of evidence on student achievement of course Outcome 4 in combination with one or more of the other course outcomes.*
20–40%	**Construction of argument** This assessment type allows for the demonstration of skills and concepts in critical reasoning and methods of inquiry. It is particularly suited to an extended written response such as an essay, feature article, letter, journal entry and/or editorial. *Best suited to the collection of evidence on student achievement of course Outcomes 2, 3 and 4.*
10–30%	**Philosophical inquiry** This assessment type assesses student participation in the community of inquiry, which is essential to the practice of philosophy in the course. It also includes the possibility of an open-ended research or a small research task. Tasks involve an investigation of key concepts, thinkers and/or thinking, and allow for the application of possible solutions to identified problems. This assessment type encourages the exploration of concepts and their development, the reflection on learning processes, and the critical evaluation and modification of concepts. Students may choose written, oral or multimedia presentation. Students may use online discussion boards, groups, blogs or group emails. Students may produce philosophical dialogues using critical and creative thinking. *Best suited to the collection of evidence on student achievement of course Outcome 1 in combination with one or more of the other course outcomes.*
0–20%	**Examination** This assessment type allows for the demonstration of understanding on items of critical reasoning, philosophical analysis and evaluation of texts, and the construction of argument. *Suited to the collection of evidence of student achievement of all course outcomes.*

UNIT 2APAE

Unit description
The unit description provides the focus for teaching the specific unit content.

The focus for this unit is **reason and persons**. Students examine reasoning, inference, doubt, and proof: the construction of world views; ideas of mind, body and personhood; ideas of action, intention, motives, free-will and determinism; and the elements of a personal ethic.

Suggested learning contexts
Within the broad area of **reason and persons**, teachers may choose one or more of the suggested learning contexts (this is not an exhaustive list):
- speculative fiction, including film, books, cartoons
- freedom, individuality, authenticity and autonomy
- self-interest, identity and society such as who am I?, where do I belong?
- character and integrity such as what does it mean to be a good person?

Unit content
This unit includes knowledge, understandings and skills to the degree of complexity described below. This is the examinable content of the course.

How do we know?

Critical reasoning
- recognising and evaluating an argument in terms of its premises, inferences and conclusions
- recognising statements in a variety of texts as either argumentative, descriptive, narrative or explanatory
- understanding modus ponens and modus tollens.

Methods of inquiry
- distinction between empirical evidence and rational proof
- inductive and deductive arguments
- observation and thought—experiment
- types of inquiry: dialectic.

Imagination and interpretation
- the relationship between reason and imagination
- distinction between perception, rational reflection and various sources of imagination.

Analysing, clarifying and evaluating concepts
- concepts of mind, body and personhood
- concepts of action, intention, will, motives and reasons
- the idea of free will.

What is real?

Scientific world view
- science as a way of classifying the world and constructing our understanding of what is real in human nature
- different ideas of human nature.

Conceptions of ultimate reality
- conceptual difficulties with free-will, determinism and agency (human action)
- concepts of change and causation.

Persons
- the concept of being 'an individual'
- relationship between individuals and societies
- the social element in individual identity
- personal identity, gender, race, class and ethnicity.

How should we live?

Governance
- the distinction between contractual and non-contractual relationships.

Communities and cultures
- justice, fairness and power relations including race, gender and class.

Self and others
- the nature of virtues and vices and their relationship to the development of character and ethical action
- the concept of care e.g. care for, care about and taking care
- the role of principled decisions in ethics e.g. the Golden Rule, greatest happiness principle and categorical imperative.

Assessment

The four types of assessment in the table below are consistent with the teaching and learning strategies considered to be the most supportive of student achievement of the outcomes in the Philosophy and Ethics course. The table provides details of the assessment type, examples of different ways that these assessment types can be applied and the weighting range for each assessment type.

Weighting Stage 2	Type of assessment
20–40%	**Analysis, clarification and evaluation** This assessment type allows for the philosophical analysis and evaluation of texts (e.g. community of inquiry transcripts, passages and/or images) and involves summarising, explaining and critiquing arguments through a range of written and oral responses. It is particularly suitable to the assessment of critical reasoning skills. *Best suited to the collection of evidence on student achievement of course Outcome 4 in combination with one or more of the other course outcomes.*
20–40%	**Construction of argument** This assessment type allows for the demonstration of skills and concepts in critical reasoning and methods of inquiry. It is particularly suited to an extended written response such as an essay, feature article, letter, journal entry and/or editorial. *Best suited to the collection of evidence on student achievement of course Outcomes 2, 3 and 4.*
10–30%	**Philosophical inquiry** This assessment type assesses student participation in the community of inquiry, which is essential to the practice of philosophy in the course. It also includes the possibility of an open-ended research or a small research task. Tasks involve an investigation of key concepts, thinkers and/or thinking, and allow for the application of possible solutions to identified problems. This assessment type encourages the exploration of concepts and their development, the reflection on learning processes, and the critical evaluation and modification of concepts. Students may choose written, oral or multimedia presentation. Students may use online discussion boards, groups, blogs or group emails. Students may produce philosophical dialogues using critical and creative thinking. *Best suited to the collection of evidence on student achievement of course Outcome 1 in combination with one or more of the other course outcomes.*
10–30%	**Examination** This assessment type allows for the demonstration of understanding on items of critical reasoning, philosophical analysis and evaluation of texts, and the construction of argument. *Suited to the collection of evidence of student achievement of all course outcomes.*

UNIT 2BPAE

Unit description

The unit description provides the focus for teaching the specific unit content.

The focus for this unit is **reason and culture**. Students examine ideas of beauty and aesthetics: the interpretation of art and literature; the idea of culture; intuition and emotion; and personal relationships and friendship.

Suggested learning contexts

Within the broad area of **reason and culture**, teachers may choose one or more of the suggested learning contexts (this is not an exhaustive list):
- understanding art and beauty and their place in culture through the ages
- multiculturalism and ethnic/cultural differences
- critical textual analysis
- emotion, intuition and gender.

Unit content

This unit includes knowledge, understandings and skills to the degree of complexity described below. This is the examinable content of the course.

How do we know?

Critical reasoning
- distinguishing between strong and weak arguments in terms of inferential strength and the concept of cogency
- identifying some of the major informal fallacies including the genetic fallacy, ad hominem arguments, hasty generalisation, argument from irrelevant authority, argument from ignorance and equivocation
- identifying the formal fallacies of denying the antecedent and affirming the consequent.

Methods of inquiry
- the use of observation, hypotheses and theories in constructing explanations
- the role of metaphor and analogy in inquiry
- types of inquiry: hermeneutics.

Imagination and interpretation
- interpreting works of art e.g. painting, sculpture, music and/or film
- interpreting literature e.g. poetry, drama and novels and/or short stories
- criteria for good interpretations including coherence, consistency, comprehensiveness and consilience

- imagination as a necessary element in interpretation.

Analysing, clarifying and evaluating concepts
- various aesthetic concepts e.g. beauty, taste, judgement, appreciation, symmetry, form and harmony
- the concept of interpretation
- use of symbols, signs and signification (semiosis) to understand the world
- disputes about realism and the limits of interpretation including modernism and postmodernism.

What is real?

Scientific world view
- perception and aesthetic appreciation
- the question of objectivity
- understanding the idea of 'subjectivity'.

Conceptions of ultimate reality
- use of symbols and concepts to understand the way things are
- ideas of truth, representation and reality and their interrelationship.

Persons
- interrelationships between personhood, emotion and reason
- emotions and emotional responses e.g. how artwork, music, literature and film can help us to understand better.

How should we live?

Governance
- the concept of rights
- freedom of expression
- the limits of privacy
- government interference and surveillance.

Communities and cultures
- the concept of culture e.g. consumer culture, sporting culture and intellectual culture
- the anthropological concept of culture
- the artistic concept of culture
- self-expression and culture.

Self and others
- friendship and other personal relationships
- the I-thou relationship as a fundamental element of ethics.

Assessment

The four types of assessment in the table below are consistent with the teaching and learning strategies considered to be the most supportive of student achievement of the outcomes in the Philosophy and Ethics course. The table provides details of the assessment type, examples of different ways that these assessment types can be applied and the weighting range for each assessment type.

Weighting Stage 2	Type of assessment
20–40%	**Analysis, clarification and evaluation** This assessment type allows for the philosophical analysis and evaluation of texts (e.g. community of inquiry transcripts, passages and/or images) and involves summarising, explaining and critiquing arguments through a range of written and oral responses. It is particularly suitable to the assessment of critical reasoning skills. *Best suited to the collection of evidence on student achievement of course Outcome 4 in combination with one or more of the other course outcomes.*
20–40%	**Construction of argument** This assessment type allows for the demonstration of skills and concepts in critical reasoning and methods of inquiry. It is particularly suited to an extended written response such as an essay, feature article, letter, journal entry and/or editorial. *Best suited to the collection of evidence on student achievement of course Outcomes 2, 3 and 4.*
10–30%	**Philosophical inquiry** This assessment type assesses student participation in the community of inquiry, which is essential to the practice of philosophy in the course. It also includes the possibility of an open-ended research or a small research task. Tasks involve an investigation of key concepts, thinkers and/or thinking, and allow for the application of possible solutions to identified problems. This assessment type encourages the exploration of concepts and their development, the reflection on learning processes, and the critical evaluation and modification of concepts. Students may choose written, oral or multimedia presentation. Students may use online discussion boards, groups, blogs or group emails. Students may produce philosophical dialogues using critical and creative thinking. *Best suited to the collection of evidence on student achievement of course Outcome 1 in combination with one or more of the other course outcomes.*
10–30%	**Examination** This assessment type allows for the demonstration of understanding on items of critical reasoning, philosophical analysis and evaluation of texts, and the construction of argument. *Suited to the collection of evidence of student achievement of all course outcomes.*

UNIT 3APAE

Unit description

The unit description provides the focus for teaching the specific unit content.

The focus for this unit is **reason and society**. Students examine the mapping of arguments: humanism, religion and values; individualism and social identity; the ideals of a good society; and the ideals of politics and government.

Suggested learning contexts

Within the broad area of **reason and society**, teachers may choose one or more of the suggested learning contexts (this is not an exhaustive list):
- political philosophy, and the uses and abuses of power
- current political events, arguments and policy issues
- utopia and dystopia
- environmental ethics.

Unit content

This unit includes knowledge, understandings and skills to the degree of complexity described below. This is the examinable content of the course.

How do we know?

Critical reasoning
- numbering statements, bracketing premises, circling inference indicators and underlining conclusions in argument
- mapping simple arguments in diagram form i.e. single inferential moves that are either a serial, convergent, divergent or linked inference
- evaluating simple arguments i.e. inferential strength and cogency
- exploring more informal fallacies including appeal to adverse consequences such as scare tactics, false dichotomy, begging the question and straw man argument
- identifying weasel words i.e. intentionally ambiguous words.

Methods of inquiry
- the scientific method including falsification, the role of thought-experiment, deduction, induction and the problem of induction
- the method of sceptical doubt in philosophical inquiry
- the concept of phenomenology: reflection on the structure and meaning of conscious experience.

Imagination and interpretation
- the idea of a good society
- the concepts of utopia and dystopia in works of imagination.

Analysing, clarifying and evaluating concepts
- the concepts of justice, fairness, liberty, equality, rights and tolerance
- criteria for a good society e.g. communication, security, education, health and welfare, parenting, and agreed decision-making processes and procedures
- ideas of the common good and of public goods.

What is real?

Scientific world view
- various relationships between science and society e.g. the assumption the scientific method is the dominant paradigm for reality
- the applicability of scientific studies for understanding human beings and their societies.

Conceptions of ultimate reality
- humanism, secular society, religion and ultimate values.

Persons
- idea of social identity and social membership
- social conformity and the idea of individualism
- the concept of marginalisation.

How should we live?

Governance
- the idea of a social contract and its forms
- the concept of liberal democracy and its forms
- concepts of socialism, liberalism and libertarianism
- values of liberal democracy
- social policy, social planning and public goods.

Communities and cultures
- moral concepts in different cultures e.g. guilt, shame, saving face, respect, cooperation and honour.

Self and others
- moral theories in ethical decision-making including utilitarianism and deontology
- the idea of social responsibility
- obligations to those in my society and to those outside my society
- obligations society has to people and the person
- obligations to the non-human world.

Assessment

The four types of assessment in the table below are consistent with the teaching and learning strategies considered to be the most supportive of student achievement of the outcomes in the Philosophy and Ethics course. The table provides details of the assessment type, examples of different ways that these assessment types can be applied and the weighting range for each assessment type.

Weighting Stage 3	Type of assessment
20–40%	**Analysis, clarification and evaluation** This assessment type allows for the philosophical analysis and evaluation of texts (e.g. community of inquiry transcripts, passages and/or images) and involves summarising, explaining and critiquing arguments through a range of written and oral responses. It is particularly suitable to the assessment of critical reasoning skills. *Best suited to the collection of evidence on student achievement of course Outcome 4 in combination with one or more of the other course outcomes.*
20–40%	**Construction of argument** This assessment type allows for the demonstration of skills and concepts in critical reasoning and methods of inquiry. It is particularly suited to an extended written response such as an essay, feature article, letter, journal entry and/or editorial. *Best suited to the collection of evidence on student achievement of course Outcomes 2, 3 and 4.*
10–30%	**Philosophical inquiry** This assessment type assesses student participation in the community of inquiry, which is essential to the practice of philosophy in the course. It also includes the possibility of an open-ended research or a small research task. Tasks involve an investigation of key concepts, thinkers and/or thinking, and allow for the application of possible solutions to identified problems. This assessment type encourages the exploration of concepts and their development, the reflection on learning processes, and the critical evaluation and modification of concepts. Students may choose written, oral or multimedia presentation. Students may use online discussion boards, groups, blogs or group emails. Students may produce philosophical dialogues using critical and creative thinking. *Best suited to the collection of evidence on student achievement of course Outcome 1 in combination with one or more of the other course outcomes.*
10–30%	**Examination** This assessment type allows for the demonstration of understanding on items of critical reasoning, philosophical analysis and evaluation of texts, and the construction of argument. *Suited to the collection of evidence of student achievement of all course outcomes.*

UNIT 3BPAE

Unit description
The unit description provides the focus for teaching the specific unit content.

The focus for this unit is **reason and meaning.** Students examine complex arguments; a number of higher-order systems of inquiry; ways of understanding the relationship between religion and science; and ethical issues of life and death.

Suggested learning contexts
Within the broad area of **reason and meaning**, teachers may choose one or more of the suggested learning contexts (this is not an exhaustive list):
* religion and science
* language and the making of meaning
* bioethics: questions of life and death.

Unit content
This unit includes knowledge, understandings and skills to the degree of complexity described below. This is the examinable content of the course.

How do we know?

Critical reasoning
* mapping complex arguments in diagram form i.e. 3–5 premises; 2–3 inferential moves; a combination of serial, linked and/or convergent and divergent inferences
* evaluating complex arguments i.e. inferential strength and cogency
* identifying, combining and rewriting difficult statements in arguments commensurate to their function as premises and conclusions
* the role of complex sentences, conditionals and connectives in argument i.e. if/then; and; but; or
* exploring more fallacies including the definist fallacy, post hoc ergo propter hoc, non sequitur, and confusion of correlation and causation
* distinguishing between analytic and synthetic statements.

Methods of inquiry
* theories of knowledge e.g. empiricism, rationalism, intuitionism
* types of inquiry: existentialism, postmodernism.

Imagination and interpretation
* religion as an interpretation of religious and mystical experiences
* comparison of religious experience with scientific 'experience'
* the possibility of misinterpretation with regard to religion and scientific methodologies.

Analysing, clarifying and evaluating concepts
* the concept of theism and the various forms of theism e.g. monotheism, polytheism, animism, pantheism and panentheism
* ideas of divinity e.g. personified, impersonal, transcendent and immanent
* concepts of naturalism, materialism, atheism and agnosticism.

What is real?

Scientific world view
* evolution and religion
* Darwin's theory of evolution as an example of scientific theorising.

Conceptions of ultimate reality
* religious and non-religious ideas of the meaning of life
* death and the meaning of life
* theism and the problem of evil.

Persons
* ideas of faith, belief, knowledge, reason and meaning, and their interrelationships
* the concept of authenticity.

How should we live?

Governance
* citizenship, civic involvement, the public sphere and meaningful lives.

Communities and cultures
* the absolutist claim that moral standards, values and rules apply in all cultures
* the relativist claim that moral standards, values and rules are right for one culture, but not another.

Self and others
* ethical issues of life and death i.e. murder, manslaughter, killing in war, abortion, euthanasia, capital punishment and the killing of animals.

Assessment

The four types of assessment in the table below are consistent with the teaching and learning strategies considered to be the most supportive of student achievement of the outcomes in the Philosophy and Ethics course. The table provides details of the assessment type, examples of different ways that these assessment types can be applied and the weighting range for each assessment type.

Weighting Stage 3	Type of assessment
20–40%	**Analysis, clarification and evaluation** This assessment type allows for the philosophical analysis and evaluation of texts (e.g. community of inquiry transcripts, passages and/or images) and involves summarising, explaining and critiquing arguments through a range of written and oral responses. It is particularly suitable to the assessment of critical reasoning skills. *Best suited to the collection of evidence on student achievement of course Outcome 4 in combination with one or more of the other course outcomes.*
20–40%	**Construction of argument** This assessment type allows for the demonstration of skills and concepts in critical reasoning and methods of inquiry. It is particularly suited to an extended written response such as an essay, feature article, letter, journal entry and/or editorial. *Best suited to the collection of evidence on student achievement of course Outcomes 2, 3 and 4.*
10–30%	**Philosophical inquiry** This assessment type assesses student participation in the community of inquiry, which is essential to the practice of philosophy in the course. It also includes the possibility of an open-ended research or a small research task. Tasks involve an investigation of key concepts, thinkers and/or thinking, and allow for the application of possible solutions to identified problems. This assessment type encourages the exploration of concepts and their development, the reflection on learning processes, and the critical evaluation and modification of concepts. Students may choose written, oral or multimedia presentation. Students may use online discussion boards, groups, blogs or group emails. Students may produce philosophical dialogues using critical and creative thinking. *Best suited to the collection of evidence on student achievement of course Outcome 1 in combination with one or more of the other course outcomes.*
10–30%	**Examination** This assessment type allows for the demonstration of understanding on items of critical reasoning, philosophical analysis and evaluation of texts, and the construction of argument. *Suited to the collection of evidence of student achievement of all course outcomes.*

**Examination details
Stage 2 and Stage 3**

Philosophy and Ethics
Examination design brief
Stage 2

Time allowed
Reading time before commencing work: ten minutes
Working time for paper: three hours

Permissible items
Standard items: pens (blue/black preferred), pencils (including coloured), sharpener, correction
                    tape/fluid, eraser, ruler, highlighters
Special items: nil

Section	Supporting information
Section One **Reasoning and inquiry skills** 30% of the total examination 15–20 short answer questions Suggested working time: 50 minutes	Questions are structured to test specific skills in critical reasoning and methods of inquiry. All items and instructions are in natural language.
Section Two **Philosophical analysis** 40% of the total examination Two extended answer questions Suggested working time: 80 minutes	This section of the examination tests the candidate's ability to identify, clarify and evaluate ideas, concepts and/or assumptions in dialogues and text in ordinary language. The first question in this section contains a compulsory text and asks the candidate to evaluate an extract of philosophical dialogue in light of criteria drawn from the community of inquiry. The second question in this section requires candidates to respond to at least one of three texts. These texts have a common ethical, epistemological and/or metaphysical theme or issue, and are typically a combination of print and non-print items.
Section Three **Extended argument** 30% of the total examination One question from a choice of five Suggested working time: 50 minutes	This section of the examination tests the candidate's ability to structure an argument. The candidate is encouraged to use their school-based learning experiences in the community of inquiry as evidence. The candidate is required to define their terms or concepts, put forward a premise or thesis, employ examples and counter-examples, justify the development of the argument, avoid contradiction, synthesise contrary claims and establish a conclusion that follows from the premise and the examples. Some questions could be accompanied by visual stimuli.

Philosophy and Ethics
Examination design brief
Stage 3

Time allowed
Reading time before commencing work: ten minutes
Working time for paper: three hours

Permissible items
Standard items: pens (blue/black preferred), pencils (including coloured), sharpener, correction tape/fluid, eraser, ruler, highlighters
Special items: nil

Section	Supporting information
Section One **Reasoning and inquiry skills** 30% of the total examination 8–10 short answer questions Suggested working time: 50 minutes	Questions are structured to test specific skills in critical reasoning and methods of inquiry. All items and instructions are in natural language.
Section Two **Philosophical analysis** 40% of the total examination Two extended answer questions Suggested working time: 80 minutes	This section of the examination tests the candidate's ability to identify, clarify and evaluate arguments and assumptions in conceptually challenging dialogues and texts. The first question in this section contains a compulsory text and asks the candidate to evaluate an extract of philosophical dialogue in light of criteria drawn from the community of inquiry. The second question in this section requires the candidate to respond to one of three print texts. These texts could deal with any combination of ethical, epistemological and/or metaphysical themes or issues.
Section Three **Extended argument** 30% of the total examination One question from a choice of five Suggested working time: 50 minutes	This section of the examination tests the candidate's ability to structure an argument. The candidate is encouraged to use their school-based learning experiences in the community of inquiry as evidence. The candidate is required to define their terms or concepts, put forward a premise or thesis, employ examples and counter-examples, justify the development of the argument, avoid contradiction, synthesise contrary claims and establish a conclusion that follows from the premise and the examples. Some questions could be accompanied by visual stimuli.

Appendix 1: Grade descriptions

Grade descriptions
Philosophy and Ethics
Stage 1

School Curriculum and Standards Authority

A	**Scope of enquiry** Diagnoses problematic aspects in familiar propositions, issues, assumptions and/or concepts in order to modify hypotheses.
	Cogency of argument Weighs ideas against one another, using relevant examples and counter-examples to clarify and/or correct thinking.
	Relevance of inference Makes inferences about a range of concepts, evidence, claims and/or arguments.
	Range of evidence Analyses and evaluates concepts and/or evidence using analogies.

B	**Scope of enquiry** Uses open questions to explore familiar propositions, issues, assumptions and/or concepts in order to generate hypotheses.
	Cogency of argument Connects relevant ideas and/or reasons in order to establish a controlled and coherent perspective.
	Relevance of inference Narrates, describes and/or explains strong and weak claims in a text and/or experience.
	Range of evidence Uses evidence and/or concepts to generate analogies.

C	**Scope of enquiry** Uses questions and provides definitions and/or examples that enable some propositions and conclusions to be made.
	Cogency of argument Explains and/or adjusts ideas and/or reasons with a general sense of purpose.
	Relevance of inference Engages with concepts and/or claims identified in a text and/or experience in a generalised way.
	Range of evidence Examines evidence and concepts to separate facts from opinions and/or concrete from abstract.

D	**Scope of enquiry** Uses questions and provides definitions and/or examples haphazardly so that propositions and conclusions are vague.
	Cogency of argument Connects ideas clumsily and/or crudely with little or no engagement and/or explanation.
	Relevance of inference Asserts claims and/or questions rashly and shows a limited engagement with a text and/or experience.
	Range of evidence Uses evidence carelessly, making hasty generalisations about concepts.

E	**Scope of enquiry** Relies on simplistic assumptions, definitions and/or closed questions to present a case.
	Cogency of argument Struggles to identify causality between concepts.
	Relevance of inference Responds in a defensive manner and reacts personally to a concept, text and/or experience.
	Range of evidence Ignores evidence and/or concepts in favour of dogmatic views.

Grade descriptions
Philosophy and Ethics
Stage 2

School Curriculum and Standards Authority

A	**Scope of enquiry** Formulates hypotheses based on theory and/or observation to interpret and explain issues, assumptions and/or concepts.
	Cogency of argument Identifies, evaluates and explains some cogent structures and/or fallacies that shape arguments.
	Relevance of inference Employs deductive and/or inductive inferences that fit logically and/or naturally concepts, evidence and/or arguments.
	Range of evidence Uses analogies to generate thought experiments that clarify complex concepts, problems and/or evidence.

B	**Scope of enquiry** Diagnoses problematic aspects in familiar propositions, issues, assumptions and/or concepts in order to modify hypotheses.
	Cogency of argument Weighs ideas against one another, using relevant examples and counter-examples to clarify and/or correct thinking.
	Relevance of inference Makes inferences about a range of concepts, evidence, claims and/or arguments.
	Range of evidence Analyses and evaluates concepts and/or evidence using analogies.

C	**Scope of enquiry** Uses open questions to explore familiar propositions, issues, assumptions and/or concepts in order to generate hypotheses.
	Cogency of argument Connects relevant ideas and/or reasons in order to establish a controlled and coherent perspective.
	Relevance of inference Narrates, describes and/or explains strong and weak claims in a text and/or experience.
	Range of evidence Separates fact from opinion and/or concrete from abstract in evidence and/or concepts to generate analogies.

D	**Scope of enquiry** Uses questions and provides definitions and/or examples that enable some propositions and conclusions to be made.
	Cogency of argument Explains and/or adjusts ideas and/or reasons with a general sense of purpose.
	Relevance of inference Engages concepts and/ or claims identified in a text and/or experience in a generalised way.
	Range of evidence Examines evidence and concepts to separate facts from opinions and/or concrete from abstract.

E	**Scope of enquiry** Relies on simplistic and/or haphazard examples, definitions and/or closed questions to present a case.
	Cogency of argument Struggles with causality between concepts and/or connects ideas with little engagement and/or explanation.
	Relevance of inference Asserts in a defensive manner and reacts personally to a concept, text and/or experience.
	Range of evidence Ignores evidence and/or concepts in favour of dogmatic views or hasty generalisations.

Grade descriptions
Philosophy and Ethics
Stage 3

School Curriculum and Standards Authority

A	**Scope of enquiry** Refines hypotheses to take into account consistency, coherence, precision and/or consilience.
	Cogency of argument Applies critical reasoning clearly to construct and/or identify cogent arguments with a range of complexity and scope.
	Relevance of inference Maps deductive and/or inductive inferences correctly in order to take inquiries in the right direction.
	Range of evidence Engages with a variety of concepts, claims, analogies, thought experiments and/or evidence to reform and/or refine problems.

B	**Scope of enquiry** Formulates hypotheses based on theory and/or observation to interpret and explain issues, assumptions and/or concepts.
	Cogency of argument Identifies, evaluates and explains some cogent structures and/or fallacies that shape arguments.
	Relevance of inference Employs deductive and/or inductive inferences that fit logically and/or naturally concepts, evidence and/or arguments.
	Range of evidence Uses analogy and evidence to generate thought experiments that clarify and/or critique problems.

C	**Scope of enquiry** Diagnoses problematic aspects in familiar propositions, issues, assumptions and/or concepts in order to modify hypotheses.
	Cogency of argument Weighs ideas against one another, using relevant examples and counter-examples to clarify and/or correct thinking.
	Relevance of inference Makes inferences about a range of concepts, evidence, claims and/or arguments.
	Range of evidence Analyses and evaluates concepts and/or evidence using analogies.

D	**Scope of enquiry** Uses open questions to explore familiar propositions, issues, assumptions and/or concepts in order to generate hypotheses.
	Cogency of argument Connects relevant ideas and/or reasons in order to establish a controlled and coherent perspective.
	Relevance of inference Narrates, describes and/or explains strong and weak claims in a text and/or experience.
	Range of evidence Separates fact from opinion and/or concrete from abstract in evidence and/or concepts to generate analogies.

E	**Scope of enquiry** Relies on simplistic and/or haphazard examples, definitions propositions and/or closed questions to present a case.
	Cogency of argument Struggles with causality between concepts and/or connects ideas with little engagement and/or explanation.
	Relevance of inference Asserts in a defensive and/or generalised manner and reacts personally to a concept, text and/or experience.
	Range of evidence Ignores evidence and/or the ideas of others in favour of dogmatic views or hasty generalisations.